



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,966	06/27/2003	Rotem Cooper	030292	3059

7590 04/24/2008
QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER

KARIKARI, KWASI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/607,966	Applicant(s) COOPER ET AL.	
	Examiner KWASI KARIKARI	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 01/18/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In the remarks, the Applicant argues that Narasimha (U.S. 20040160918 A1), (hereinafter Narasimha) does not fully reject the claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 22 and 24.

The examiner disagrees with such assertion since he must give each claim presented its broadest reasonable interpretation.

Claim 1 states; [“a controller operative to obtain a network operator identifier from the first signaling message, search a preferred roaming list for an entry with the network operator identifier” and “wherein the network operator identifier distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network”].

The examiner notes that there is very little description in the claim limitation which empirically narrows the manner in which the examiner must interpret such claimed limitations.

Narasimha clearly teaches “a controller operative to obtain a network operator identifier from the first signaling message, search a preferred roaming list for an entry with the network operator identifier” (= broadcast of system information; and system information is available to mobile station 100, see Par. 0031; and mobile scan for available channel; and determines if the SID and /or NID of the system is listed on the preferred roaming list PRL, see Pars. 0031-32). The mobile station also includes controller 170.

Furthermore, Narasimha teaches “wherein the network operator identifier distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network” (= CDMA system; and each system record includes system identification, SID and network identification, NID, see Pars. 0022-23).

The same above clarification also applies to **claims 5, 17 and 19** since they have similar claimed limitations as claim 1.

b. **Claim 22** states; [“wherein at least one record in the set of records has a system identification (SID) value that is in a set of SID values used to indicate network operator identifiers” and “wherein the network operator identifier distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network”].

The examiner notes that there is very little description in the claim limitation which empirically narrows the manner in which the examiner must interpret such claimed limitations.

Narasimha clearly teaches “wherein at least one record in the set of records has a system identification (SID) value that is in a set of SID values used to indicate network operator identifiers” and “wherein the network operator identifier distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network” (= CDMA system; and each system record includes system identification, SID and network identification, NID, see Pars. 0022-23).

The same above clarification also applies to **claim 24**, since it has similar claimed limitation as claim 22.

c. **In claim 8 and 9**, Applicant argues that the combination of Narasimha and Le et al. (U.S 6,556,820) is not proper since the reason for the combination is not given.

The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that both references show mobile communication systems (see Narasimha, Fig. 1; and Fig. 1 of Le), which would serve as the factual motivation to combine both reference.

Therefore, the combination of Narasimha and Le is proper.

d. In the remarks, the Applicant argues that Narasimha in combination with Kransmo et al., (U.S 20030016639) (hereinafter, Kransmo) does not fully reject the claim 20.

Claim 20 states; [“encoding the MCC and NOC values into a system identification (SID) value and a network identification (NID) value”]

The examiner notes that there is very little description in the claim limitation which empirically narrows the manner in which the examiner must interpret such claimed limitations.

Kransmo clearly teaches “encoding the MCC and NOC values into a system identification (SID) value and a network identification (NID) value” See;

[0031] If the MS 145 is in DO mode (as indicated by feature code 118), conversion logic 112 within the MSC 110 converts the SMS message 190 into an e-mail message 195 by stripping the SMS headers off of the SMS message 190, encapsulating the text into an IP packet and routing the IP packet to the MS 145 using the IP address of the MS 145. Typically, the IP address has the form of the Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) or Internet mail (email) address of the MS 145. For example, the e-mail address may be the International Mobility Subscriber Identity (IMSI) of the MS 145 at the Internet Service Provider (ISP) of the MS 145 (i.e., IMSI@ISP.com). It should be understood that the IMSI is the unique subscriber number of the MS 145, and is not the dialable number associated with the MS 145. The IMSI is used for signaling purposes within the CDMA2000 network 100 and consists of a Mobile Country Code (MCC), Mobile Network Code (MNC) and Mobile Subscriber Identification Number (MSIN). The IMSI has a maximum length of 15 digits.

e. Rejection for the amended claims 25,27 and 28 are shown below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-7, 12-19 and 22-24 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Narasimha (U.S 20040160918 A1), (hereinafter Narasimha).

Regarding claims 1,5,17 and 19, Narasimha discloses an apparatus/method (= mobile terminal 100, see Par. 0022 and Fig. 1) in a code division multiple access (CDMA) communication network, comprising:

a message processor operative to process a first signaling message received from a base station in the CDMA network (= broadcast of system information; and system information is available to mobile station 100, see Par. 0031); and
a controller (= controller 170) operative to obtain a network operator identifier from the first signaling message, search a preferred roaming list for an entry with the network operator identifier (= mobile scan for available channel; and determines if the SID and /or NID of the system is listed on the PRL, see Pars. 0031-32), and provide an indication of whether or not the CDMA network is accessible based on result of the search (= mobile station 100 remains on the most preferred channel, once a channel in the most preferred system is acquired, see Par. 0032) wherein the network operator identifier distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network (see Par. 0023)

Regarding claims 2, 6 and 18, as recited in claims 1, 5 and 17, Narasimha discloses the apparatus, wherein the message processor is further operative to process a second signaling message received from the base station, and wherein the controller is further operative to extract a system identification (SID) value and a network identification (NID) value from the second signaling message and compare the extracted SID and NID values against SID and NID values stored in the preferred roaming list (= broadcast of

system information; system information is available to mobile station 100; and determining if SID and/or NID is the PRL, see Pars. 0023 and 0031-32).

Regarding claims 3 and 7, as recited in claims 2 and 6, Narasimha discloses the apparatus, wherein the controller is operative to obtain the network operator identifier and search the preferred roaming list only if the extracted SID and NID values do not match the SID and NID values stored in the preferred roaming list (see Pars. 0031-32).

Regarding claim 4 and 12, as recited in claims 1 and 5, Narasimha discloses the apparatus, wherein, to search for the network operator identifier in the preferred roaming list, the controller is operative to encode the network operator identifier into a system identification (SID) value and a network identification (NID) value and compare the encoded SID and NID values against SID and NID values stored in the preferred roaming list (= broadcast of system information; system information is available to mobile station 100; and determining if SID and/or NID is the PRL, see Pars. 0023 and 0031-32).

Regarding claims 13-15 as recited in claim 12, Narasimha discloses SID (see Pars. 0031-32) but does not disclose expressly, the method, wherein the encoded SID value falls within a range (26,112 to 31,1003 and 31,100 or 31,101) of values excluded from assignment to network operators for system identification.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a SID value that falls within a range (26,112 to 31,1003 and 31,100 or 31,101) of values excluded from assignment to network operators for system identification.

Applicant has not disclosed that a SID value that falls within a range (26,112 to 31,1003 and 31,100 or 31,101) of values provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the broadcasted information (SID) that is made available from the system (see Par. 0031-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a SID value as disclosed in Narasimha to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13-15.

Regarding claims 16, as recited in claim 5, Narasimha discloses the method, wherein the network operator identifier indicates that the CDMA network is accessible and located in a foreign country with respect to a home network (see Pars. 0023 and 0031-32).

Regarding claims 22 and 24, Narasimha discloses an apparatus/method (= mobile terminal 100, see Par. 0022 and Fig. 1) in a code division multiple access (CDMA) communication network, comprising:

a message processor operative to process at least one signaling message received from a base station in the CDMA network (= broadcast of system information; and system information is available to mobile station 100, see Par. 0031);

a controller (= controller 170) operative to obtain a set of records for a preferred roaming list from the at least one signaling message, wherein at least one record in the set of records has a system identification (SID) value that is in a set of SID values used to indicate network operator identifiers (= mobile scan for available channel; and determines if the SID and /or NID of the system is listed on the PRL, see Pars. 0031-32) and wherein each of the at least one record includes a network operator identifier that distinctly identifies a network operator of a CDMA network see Par. 0031); and

a memory unit operative to store the set of records for the preferred roaming list (= broadcast of system information; and system information is available to mobile station 100, see Pars. 0031-32).

Regarding claim 23 as recited in claim 22, Narasimha discloses SID (see Pars. 0031-32) but does not disclose expressly, the method, wherein the set of SID values used to indicate network operator identifiers is within a range of 26,112 to 31,103.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a SID value that falls within a range (26,112 to 31,1003). Applicant has not disclosed that a SID value that falls within a range (26,112 to 31,1003) of values provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected

Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the broadcasted information (SID) that is made available from the system (see Par. 0031-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a SID value as disclosed in Narasimha to obtain the invention as specified in claim 23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimha in view of Le et al., (U.S 6,556,820) (hereinafter, Lee).

Regarding claim 8, as recited in claim 5, Narasimha fails to specifically to disclose the method, wherein the network operator identifier comprises a mobile country code (MCC) and a network operator code (NOC).

However, Le teaches the method, wherein the network operator identifier comprises a mobile country code (MCC) and a network operator code (NOC) (see col. 8, lines 11-21).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Le with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a mobility management system that provides support for multiple subscriptions and achieves very high efficiency of signaling procedures over the air interface (see Le; col. 4, lines 50-63).

Regarding claim 9, as recited in claim 8, Narasimha fails to specifically to disclose the method, wherein the network operator code is a mobile network code (MNC).

However, Le teaches the method, wherein the network operator code is a mobile network code (MNC) (see col. 8, lines 11-21).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Le with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a mobility management system that provides support for multiple subscriptions and achieves very high efficiency of signaling procedures over the air interface (see Le; col. 4, lines 50-63).

4. Claims 10,11,20,21 and 25-28 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimha in view of Kransmo et al., (U.S 20030016639) (hereinafter, Kransmo).

Regarding claim 10, as recited in claim 5, Narasimha fails to specifically to disclose the method, wherein the first signaling message is a System Parameters Message or an Extended System Parameters Message defined by IS-2000, and wherein the network operator identifier is sent in an MCC field and an IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message.

However, Kransmo teaches the method, wherein the first signaling message is a System Parameters Message or an Extended System Parameters Message defined by IS-2000, and wherein the network operator identifier is sent in an MCC field and an IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message (= IMSI is used for signal purposes within cdma 2000 network and consists of MCC and MNC, see Par. 0031).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Kransmo with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a system that minimize signaling and improve battery life for MS (see Kransmo; Par. 0011).

Regarding claim 11, as recited in claim 5, Narasimha fails to specifically to disclose the method, wherein the network operator identifier comprises a 3-digit mobile country code (MCC) and a 3-digit mobile network code (MNC), and wherein two most significant digits of the MNC are sent in the IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message.

However, Kransmo teaches the method, wherein the network operator identifier comprises a 3-digit mobile country code (MCC) and a 3-digit mobile network code (MNC), and wherein two most significant digits of the MNC are sent in the IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message (= IMSI is used for signal purposes within cdma 2000 network and consists of MCC and MNC, see Par. 0031).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Kransmo with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a system that minimize signaling and improve battery life for MS (see Kransmo; Par. 0011).

Regarding claims 20, Narasimha discloses a method of performing system selection in a code division multiple access (CDMA) communication network, comprising:

processing a System Parameters Message or an Extended System Parameters Message received from a base station in the CDMA network (= broadcast of system information; and system information is available to mobile station 100, see Par. 0031); identification (SID) value and a network identification (NID) value (see Par. 0032);

comparing the encoded SID and NID values against SID and NID values stored in a preferred roaming list (= mobile scan for available channel; and determines if the SID and /or NID of the system is listed on the PRL, see Pars. 0031-32); and

providing an indication of whether or not the CDMA network is accessible based on result of the searching (= mobile station 100 remains on the most preferred channel,

once a channel in the most preferred system is acquired, see Par. 0032); but fails to teach obtaining a mobile country code (MCC) value and a network operator code (NOC) value from an MCC field and an IMSI 11 12 field, respectively, of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message, wherein the MCC and NOC values form a network operator identifier that distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network; encoding the MCC and NOC values into a system.

However, Kransmo teaches “obtaining a mobile country code (MCC) value and a network operator code (NOC) value from an MCC field and an IMSI 11 12 field, respectively, of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message, wherein the MCC and NOC values form a network operator identifier that distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network; encoding the MCC and NOC values into a system(= IMSI is used for signal purposes within cdma 2000 network and consists of MCC and MNC, see Par. 0031).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Kransmo with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a system that minimize signaling and improve battery life for MS (see Kransmo; Par. 0011).

Regarding claim 21, as recited in claim 20 Narasimha further discloses that the method, further comprising: extracting a SID value and a NID value from a Sync Channel Message or the System Parameters Message received from the base station; comparing the extracted SID and NID values against the SID and NID values stored in

the preferred roaming list; and performing the obtaining, encoding, comparing, and providing only if the extracted SID and NID values do not match the SID and NID values stored in the preferred roaming list (see Pars. 0031-33).

Regarding claim 25, Narasimha discloses a method of performing system selection in a code division multiple access (CDMA) communication network, comprising:

processing a System Parameters Message or an Extended System Parameters Message received from a base station in the CDMA network (= broadcast of system information; and system information is available to mobile station 100, see Par. 0031); identification (SID) value and a network identification (NID) value (see Par. 0032);

comparing the encoded SID and NID values against SID and NID values stored in a preferred roaming list (= mobile scan for available channel; and determines if the SID and /or NID of the system is listed on the PRL, see Pars. 0031-32); and

providing an indication of whether or not the CDMA network is accessible based on result of the searching (= mobile station 100 remains on the most preferred channel, once a channel in the most preferred system is acquired, see Par. 0032); but fails to teach obtaining a mobile country code (MCC) value and a network operator code (NOC) value from an MCC field and an IMSI 11 12 field, respectively, of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message, wherein the MCC and NOC values form a network operator identifier that distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network; encoding the MCC and NOC values into a system SID and NID".

However, Kransmo teaches “obtaining a mobile country code (MCC) value and a network operator code (NOC) value from an MCC field and an IMSI 11 12 field, respectively, of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message, wherein the MCC and NOC values form a network operator identifier that distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network; encoding the MCC and NOC values into a system SID and NID”. See:[0031], If the MS 145 is in DO mode (as indicated by feature code 118), conversion logic 112 within the MSC 110 converts the SMS message 190 into an e-mail message 195 by stripping the SMS headers off of the SMS message 190, encapsulating the text into an IP packet and routing the IP packet to the MS 145 using the IP address of the MS 145. Typically, the IP address has the form of the Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) or Internet mail (email) address of the MS 145. For example, the e-mail address may be the International Mobility Subscriber Identity (IMSI) of the MS 145 at the Internet Service Provider (ISP) of the MS 145 (i.e., IMSI@ISP.com). It should be understood that the IMSI is the unique subscriber number of the MS 145, and is not the dialable number associated with the MS 145. The IMSI is used for signaling purposes within the CDMA2000 network 100 and consists of a Mobile Country Code (MCC), Mobile Network Code (MNC) and Mobile Subscriber Identification Number (MSIN). The IMSI has a maximum length of 15 digits.

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Kransmo with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a system that minimize signaling and improve battery life for MS (see Kransmo; Par. 0011).

Regarding claim 26, as recited in claim 25, Narasimha fails to disclose that the apparatus, wherein the network operator code is a mobile network code (MNC).

However, Kransmo teaches that the network operator code is a mobile network code (MNC) (= IMSI is used for signal purposes within cdma 2000 network and consists of MCC and MNC, see Par. 0031).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Kransmo with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a system that minimize signaling and improve battery life for MS (see Kransmo; Par. 0011).

Regarding claims 27 and 28, Narasimha discloses a method/apparatus of transmitting a network operator identifier in a code division multiple access (CDMA) communication network, comprising:

processing the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message for transmission over a wireless link (= broadcast of system information; and system information is available to mobile station 100, see Par. 0031); but fails specifically to disclose “mapping a mobile country code (MCC) value for the network operator identifier to an MCC field of a System Parameters Message or an Extended System Parameters Message; mapping a network operator code (NOC) value for the network operator identifier to an IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message, wherein the network operator identifier distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network; encoding the MCC and NOC values into a system SID and NID”.

However, Kransmo teaches that the mapping a mobile country code (MCC) value for the network operator identifier to an MCC field of a System Parameters Message or an Extended System Parameters Message; mapping a network operator code (NOC) value for the network operator identifier to an IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message, wherein

the network operator identifier distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network (See;[0031] If the MS 145 is in DO mode (as indicated by feature code 118), conversion logic 112 within the MSC 110 converts the SMS message 190 into an e-mail message 195 by stripping the SMS headers off of the SMS message 190, encapsulating the text into an IP packet and routing the IP packet to the MS 145 using the IP address of the MS 145. Typically, the IP address has the form of the Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) or Internet mail (email) address of the MS 145. For example, the e-mail address may be the International Mobility Subscriber Identity (IMSI) of the MS 145 at the Internet Service Provider (ISP) of the MS 145 (i.e., IMSI@ISP.com). It should be understood that the IMSI is the unique subscriber number of the MS 145, and is not the dialable number associated with the MS 145. The IMSI is used for signaling purposes within the CDMA2000 network 100 and consists of a Mobile Country Code (MCC), Mobile Network Code (MNC) and Mobile Subscriber Identification Number (MSIN). The IMSI has a maximum length of 15 digits.

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Kransmo with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a system that minimize signaling and improve battery life for MS (see Kransmo; Par. 0011).

CONCLUSION

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. SEE MPEP 2141.02 [R-5] VI. PRIOR ART MUST BE CONSIDERED IN ITS ENTIRETY, INCLUDING DISCLOSURES THAT TEACH AWAY

FROM THE CLAIMS: A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) In re Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). >See also MPEP §2123.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kwasi Karikari whose telephone number is 571-272-8566. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8 am - 4pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8566.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kwasi Karikari
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617.
04/22/2008

/Charles N. Appiah/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617